

PATENT  
09/801,612

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: : Group Art Unit: 2143  
: Examiner: A. M. Lezak  
Gerald F. McBrearty et al. : Intellectual Property  
Serial No: 09/801,612 : Law Department - 4054  
Filed: 03/08/2001 : International Business  
Title: PROTECTING CONTENTS : Machines Corporation  
OF COMPUTER DATA FILES FROM : 11400 Burnet Road  
SUSPECTED INTRUDERS BY : Austin, Texas 78758  
RENAMING AND HIDING DATA : Customer No. 32,329  
FILES SUBJECTED TO INTRUSION :  
Date: August 27, 2007 :

REPLY BRIEF ON APPEAL  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O.Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is a Reply Brief to the Examiner's (corrected) Answer mailed June 29, 2007. This Reply Brief is identical to the Reply Brief filed on September 12, 2006 in response to Examiner's original Answer.

To summarize the remaining issues in the present Appeal, the patentable novelty of the present invention is the combination of: means for determining whether user requests for data are unauthorized intrusions into said requested data files; and

means, responsive to a determination that a request is an unauthorized intrusion, for changing the identification of the requested data files.

Applicants concur with Examiner that Schneck discloses determining whether received requests for data files, in a network environment, are unauthorized. Applicants also concur with Examiner's conclusion that: Schneck does not teach means, responsive to unauthorized intrusion, for changing identification of requested data files.

Applicants have traversed the rejection under 35 U.S.C 103(a) that claims 1-45 are unobvious over Schneck (US5,933,498) in view of the Margolis publication (US2002/0038296). Examiner relies on Margolis to make up for the above deficiency in the teaching of Schneck.

**Examiner's New Argument.**

Applicants have conceded that Margolis does disclose changing the names of an objects but only when new versions of objects are created. However, Applicants have argued that this has nothing to do with a response to an unauthorized intrusion, and would not be suggestive combining the Margolis means for changing names with the Schneck means for determining whether requests for data files are unauthorized.

In this connection, Examiner argues that since the claimed invention changes file identities, and Margolis changes file identities, the only difference is the intended use of the name change i.e. Margolis changes identity of an object only when a new version is made while the present invention changes identity of a file in response to an unauthorized intrusion. In effect, Examiner is arguing that there is no structural difference only a new use for the function of changing identity of a file.

Applicants submit that the structural difference is in the combination of means for determining whether user

requests for data are unauthorized intrusions into said requested data files; and means, responsive to a determination that a request is an unauthorized intrusion, for changing the identification of the requested data files.

In the present invention, the structural means for changing the identification of requested files do so in response to structural means for determining that there has been an unauthorized intrusion. At best, Margolis discloses the combination of structures for changing identities of objects in response to structures for creating new versions of objects. It has no suggestion of a structure for changing identities of objects in response to structural means for determining that there has been an unauthorized intrusion.

For this suggestion in Margolus, Examiner cites ten continuous columns (paragraphs 0011-0032) as well as paragraphs 55 and 62 and all of claims 1-153. Applicants have reviewed these sections and claims, and still fail to find any suggestion of changing the identification or name of any file responsive to an unauthorized intrusion.

In view of the foregoing and Applicants' arguments made in the Brief on Appeal, it is submitted that Claims 1-45 are unobvious over the combination of Schneck et al.

(US5,933,498) in view of the Margolus Publication (US2002/0038296), and, therefore, are patentable under 35 USC 103(a).

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Final Rejection of claims 1-45 dated February 10, 2005 be reversed, and that claims 1-45 be found to be in condition for allowance.

PATENT  
09/801,612

Respectfully submitted,

*J. B. Kraft 08/27/07*  
J. B. Kraft  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 19,226  
(512) 473-2303

PLEASE MAIL ALL CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Herman Rodriguez  
IPLaw Dept. - IMAD 4054  
IBM Corporation  
11400 Burnet Road  
Austin, Texas 78758